



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,774	02/13/2001	Yongcheng Li	RSW920000168US1	2015

7590 03/23/2004  
Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts  
IBM Corporation T81/503  
P.O. Box 12195  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/782,774

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Mylinh T Tran

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-20, 22-35 and 37-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-20, 22-35 and 37-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of: -
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's Amendment filed 01/06/04 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33 and 38 have been amended. Claims 5, 21 and 36 have been cancelled. However, limitations of amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior arts of record and newly discovered prior art, therefore, claims 1-4, 6-20, 22-35 and 37-40 are rejected under the new ground of rejection as set forth below. In addition, Applicant's amendment failed to respond to the Examiner's objection to the abstract. This objection is maintained as below.

#### ***Specification***

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract should not repeat the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 17, 20, 23-24, 33 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hitchcock et al.[US. 6,345,278].

As to claims 1, 17 and 33, Hitchcock et al. discloses a data processing system for customizing a web-based graphical user interface for an application on a data processing system wherein the application generates a plurality of screens of display (column 2, lines 35-50) and plural customization formats (column 5, lines 35-47); and initiating customization of the web-based graphical user interface using a first customization format based on the plurality of screens of display (PDF format, column 8, lines 20-35); responsive to a given event, by automatically switching from the first customization format and to a second customization format (HTML format, column 8, line 65-67 and column 9, lines 50-58).

As to claims 4 and 20, Hitchcock et al. also teaches the first customization format and the second customization format maintaining continuous interaction with the application (column 6, lines 12-37).

As to claims 7, 23 and 37, Hitchcock et al. provides responsive to completion of customization of the graphical user interface, displaying the graphical user interface based on the customization (column 5, lines 15-47).

As to claims 8 and 24, Hitchcock et al. also provides if a first format and a second format cannot be determined, initiating customization of the graphical user interface by automatically switching to a default customization format (column 8, line 65-67 and column 9, lines 50-58).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 6-7, 9-16, 18-19, 22, 25-32, 34-35 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hitchcock et al.[US. 6,345,278] in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA").

As to claims 2, 18 and 34, the differences between the claim and Hitchcock et al. are the first customization format being a macro-based customization format. "AAPA" discloses the limitation (Another approach is to use a macro

script to automatically drive the host application). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Hitchcock et al. and "AAPA" before him at the time the invention was made to modify the customization of the web-based graphical user interface as taught by Hitchcock et al., to include the first and second customization format being macro-based and screen by screen formats of "AAPA", in order to use a macro script to automatically drive the host application as taught by "AAPA". As to claims 3, 19 and 35, "AAPA" teaches the second customization format being a screen by screen customization format (A host application may be customized screen by screen).

As to claims 6 and 22, Hitchcock et al. also shows initiating customization of the graphical user interface being sent to a predefined markup (column 21, lines 13-30).

As to claims 9, 25 and 38, while "AAPA" shows the host application screen among the plurality of host application screens, Hitchcock et al. discloses retrieving a customization format from a plurality of customization formats (column 5, lines 48-60) and responsive to the retrieved customization format recognizing the host application screen, executing the retrieved customization format to customize the graphical user interface (column 8, lines 30-52).

As to claims 10, 26 and 39, "AAPA" discloses the customization format is at least one of a macro-based customization format and a screen by screen

customization format (there are hybrid approaches utilizing the screen by screen approach and the macro-based approach).

As to claims 11, 14-16, 27, 30-32 and 40, Hitchcock et al. shows matching the retrieved customization format to customization format entry points; and responsive to the retrieved customization format matching a customization entry point (column 10, lines 41-64) and reentering the retrieved customization format (column 19, lines 12-22).

As to claims 12 and 28, Hitchcock et al. provides determining whether the retrieved customization format execution is complete; and responsive to completion of the execution of the retrieved customization format, requesting another customization format (column 5, lines 48-65).

As to claims 13 and 29, Hitchcock et al. also provides detecting errors within the retrieved customization format; determining if an error handling logic exists within the data processing system; and responsive to error handling logic existing within the data processing system, activating the error handling logic (column 18, lines 35-60).

### **Response to Arguments**

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9, 14, 17, 25, 30, 33 and 38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **Conclusion**

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a

response, (703) 746-7238), may be used for formal After Final communications, (703) 746-7239 for Official communications, or (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official or draft communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8.00AM to 4.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in

Art Unit: 2174

the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at  
1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this  
application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist  
whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2174

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100